



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,476	12/15/2003	Gregory D. Vite	LD0276 NP	3475
23914	7590	10/21/2004	EXAMINER	
			BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	
DATE MAILED: 10/21/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/736,476	VITE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Venkataraman Balasubramanian	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 5 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/11, 5/21/2004</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-19 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

References cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 5/21/2004 and 8/11/2004, are made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-4 and 6-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Any claim not specifically rejected is rejected as it is dependent on a rejected claim and shares the same indefiniteness.

1. Recitation of "and pharmaceutically acceptable salts, prodrugs, enantiomers, diastereomers and solvates thereof" in claim1, renders claim 1 and its dependent claims indefinite as it is not clear whether the claim is compound claim or composition claim with above said limitations. Note Markush recitation should be in alternate form and in singular. Replacement of "and" with "or" and recitation of salt, prodrug, enantiomer, diastereomer and solvate in singular is suggested.
2. In claim 1, recitation of the term "prodrugs" is deemed as indefinite. Prodrugs in general and as noted in specification, page 14, are compounds, which undergo in vivo hydrolysis to parent active drugs. In that sense recitation of prodrug is acceptable. However, the definition of various R_n groups include such groups,

namely esters, amides, alkoxy carbonyl etc. and therefore it is not clear what is the difference between these variable groups and the prodrug group.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-4 and 6-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making prodrugs of the claimed compounds. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art of medicinal chemistry - to use the invention. "The factors to be considered in making an enablement rejection have been summarized as the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims", In re Rainer, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150, Ex parte Formal, 230 USPQ 546. a) Finding a prodrug is an empirical exercise. Predicting if a certain ester of a claimed alcohol, for example, is in fact a prodrug, and produces the active compound metabolically, in man, at a therapeutic concentration and at a useful rate is filled with experimental uncertainty. Although attempts have been made to predict drug metabolism 'de novo, this is still an experimental science. For a compound to be a prodrug, it must meet three tests. It must itself be biologically inactive. It must be metabolized to a second substance in a human

at a rate and to an extent to produce that second substance at a physiologically meaningful concentration. Thirdly, that second substance must be biologically active. Thus, determining whether a particular compound meets these three criteria in a clinical trial setting requires a large quantity of experimentation.

- b) The direction concerning the prodrugs is found in the passage spanning line 6 to 18, page 14. The books cited therein are clearly indicative of specialized nature of the art and need for experimentation of each drug.
- c) There is no working example of a prodrug of a compound the formula (I). d) The nature of the invention is clinical use of compounds and the pharmacokinetic behavior of substances in the human body.
- e) The state of the prodrug art is summarized by Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry). The table on the left side of page 976 outlines the research program to be undertaken to find a prodrug. The second paragraph in section 10 and the paragraph spanning pages 976-977 indicate the low expectation of success. In that paragraph the difficulties of extrapolating between species are further developed. Since, the prodrug concept is a pharmacokinetic issue, the lack of any standard pharmacokinetic protocol discussed in the last sentence of this paragraph is particularly relevant. Banker (Modem Pharmaceutics) in the first sentence, third paragraph on page 596 states that "extensive development must be undertaken" to find a prodrug. I) Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry) in the last paragraph on page 975 describes the artisans making Applicants' prodrugs as a collaborative team of synthetic pharmaceutical chemists and metabolism experts. All would have a Ph. D. degree and several years of industrial experience. g) It is well

established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely degree of unpredictability of the factors involved", 'and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). h) The breadth of the claims includes all of the hundreds of thousands of compounds of formula of claim I as well as the presently unknown list potential prodrug derivatives embraced by the word "prodrug".

Thus, undue experimentation will be required to determine if any particular derivative is, in fact, a prodrug.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was 'filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

Claims 1-4 and 6-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making solvates of the claimed compounds. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art of synthetic organic chemistry to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Following apply. Any claim not specifically rejected is rejected as being dependent on a rejected claim and share the same limitation.

The factors to be considered in making an enablement rejection have been summarized above. In the present case the important factors leading to a conclusion of undue experimentation are the absence of any working example of a formed solvate, the lack of predictability in the art, and the broad scope of the claims.

c) There is no working example of any solvate formed. The claims are drawn to solvates, yet the numerous examples presented all failed to produce a solvate. Specification on page 14, lines 20-21 states, "methods of solvation are generally known in the art". It is clear that the specification equates solvation of compound in a solvent as solvates which is clearly contrary to what "solvates" are. Merely dissolving a compound does not result in solvate. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co., 28 USPQ2d 1190 "The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds with the required connectivity. However ... there, is no evidence that such compounds exist... the examples of the '881 patent do not produce the postulated compounds... there is ... 'no evidence that such compounds even exist.' The same circumstance appears to be true here. There is no evidence that solvates of these compounds actually exist; if they did, they would have formed. Hence, applicants must show that solvates can be made, or limit the claims accordingly.

g) The state of the art is that is not predictable whether solvates will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a solvate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). The solvent molecule is a species

introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, "it is not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is the compositional extent". Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometry of the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host. In the same paragraph on page 365 West (Solid State Chemistry) explains that it is possible to make meta-stable non-equilibrium solvates, further clouding what Applicants mean by the word solvate. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to solvates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stable region of the solvate.

h) The breadth of the claims includes all of the hundreds of thousands of compounds of formula. (I) as well as the presently unknown list of solvents embraced by the term "solvate". Thus, the scope is broad.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make Applicants' invention.

Claims 12-19 are rejected under U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification while being enabling for treating rheumatoid arthritis, does not reasonably provide enablement for treating any proliferative diseases, any or all cancer and / or any or all "diseases associated with signal transduction pathways operating through growth factor receptors". The specification does not enable any physician skilled in the art of medicine, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The factors to be considered in making an enablement rejection have been summarized above.

The instant claims are drawn to "treating a proliferative disease" and "treating cancer", by inhibiting or modulating tyrosine kinases in general and HER kinases in specific as well as diseases associated with signal transduction pathways operating through growth factor receptors". The scope of the claims includes any or all cancer or any or all proliferative diseases due to tyrosine kinase inhibition including those yet to be discovered as due said mode of action for which there is no enabling disclosure. In addition, the scope of these claims includes treatment of various diseases, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds provided in the specification. The instant compounds are disclosed to have HER kinase inhibitory activity and it is recited that the instant compounds are therefore useful in treating any or all diseases stated above for which applicants provide no competent evidence. It appears that the applicants are asserting that the embraced compounds because of their mode action as kinase inhibitor that would be useful for all sorts of proliferative diseases and cancers, any disease which involve signal transduction pathway. However, the applicants have not provided any competent evidence that the instantly

disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended host. Moreover many if not most of diseases such as psoriasis and cancers, autoimmune diseases are very difficult to treat and despite the fact that there are many drugs, which can be used for "inflammatory condition".

The scope of the claims involves large number of compounds of claim 1 as well as the thousand of diseases embraced by the terms proliferative disease, cancer, and or the unknown list of "diseases associated with signal transduction pathways operating through growth factor receptors".

Claim 17 is also drawn to "a method of modulating receptor tyrosine kinase activity". But specification has only teaching of the instant compounds as tyrosine kinase inhibitors. See pages 14-15 and 23. The term "modulating" implies agonism, antagonism and partial agonism or antagonism. It is not known that a compound to be all of these. The specification did not provide any competent tests or data to establish that the compounds have the "modulating" effect".

Proliferative disease would include benign tumors, malignant tumors, polyps, lumps, lesions, other pre-cancerous conditions, psoriasis, leukemia, the hyper proliferation of the gastric epithelium caused by the Helicobacter pylori infection of ulcers.

Cancer is just an umbrella term. Tumors vary from those so benign that they are never treated to those so virulent that all present therapy is useless.

No compound has ever been found to treat proliferative diseases of all types generally. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be

provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "compound" is contrary to our present understanding of oncology. Cecil Textbook of Medicine states, "each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study" (see the enclosed article, page 1004). Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally. Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See *Ex parte Jovanovics*, 211 USPQ 907, 909; *In re Langer* 183 USPQ 288. Also note *Hoffman v. Klaus* 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and *Ex parte Powers* 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Interim Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 64 FR 71427 and 71440 (December 21, 1999) wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The disclosure in the instant case is not sufficient to enable the instantly claimed method treating solely based on the inhibitory activity disclosed for the compounds. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See *Mass, R. D., Int. J. Radiation Oncology Bio. Phys.* Vol. 58(3): 932-940, 2004 and *Fabbro et al. Pharmacology & therapeutics* 93, 79-98, 2002.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or

lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

- 1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic use of the compounds in treating disorders/diseases that require tyrosine kinase inhibitory activity.
- 2) The state of the prior art: Recent publications expressed that the tyrosine kinase inhibition effects are unpredictable and are still exploratory.
- 3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for treating any or all condition of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).
- 4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show treating any or all condition and the state of the art is that the effects of tyrosine kinase inhibitors are unpredictable.
- 6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace any or all proliferative diseases and cancers including those yet to be related to tyrosine kinase.

7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of enzyme-inhibitor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards treating the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was 'filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 5 is allowed as prior art search in the related area did not teach or suggest the species embraced in claim 5.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is Mukund Shah whose telephone number is (571) 272-0674. If Applicants are unable to reach Mukund Shah within 24-hour period, they may contact James O. Wilson, Acting-SPE of art unit 1624 at 571-272-0661.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Venkataraman Balasubramanian
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

10/17/2004